



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Two Isaiahs, the real and the imaginary.*—This hypothesis of two Isaiahs is the creation of German rationalists, whose plausible reasoning has persuaded English students, particularly Drs. Cheyne and Driver, to adopt similar views. Dr. Driver's "Isaiah" is the latest and most popular presentation of them. But there seems to be no sufficient reasons given for disbelieving the universal and unbroken tradition of a single Isaiah. Let the methods of the new school be considered and tested. 1) They make much use of Assyriological material, which often conflicts with the biblical statements. This is more likely to show the inaccuracy of the Assyrian than that of the prophecy. Indeed, caution must be exercised in comparing the brief, condensed, general statements of Isaiah with the Assyrian records. The former are texts, summaries, and are lacking in the definite chronological character needful for adequate comparison. 2) A similar caution must be used in giving the work of the prophet a character largely political. The latter part of Isaiah is not so much concerned about Cyrus and the exiles in Babylon as about the great consummation of the church in the far future. This view links together all of Isaiah's prophecies, the early and the late. 3) These critics affirm that Isaiah could not take his position as the later prophecies represent him, in a distant future of exile, and prophesy a still more distant future to come. He must have lived in the exile to have thus spoken of the return. But the earlier prophecies speak of an exile, and the exile in effect had been slowly going on from Solomon's time. Hence Isaiah could take the wide-spread expectation of it for granted and go on to more distant events. That he should have given names of coming persons is marvelous, yet not more so than the element of time that appears. Prophecy is usually timeless. 4) They insist that the historical element in the book must settle the date of Isaiah's work. But the prophet rises above the historical situation. God, not history, is the source of the prophecy. Besides these main positions of the critics, which are largely untenable, there are other facts against them: 1) the frequent breaks in the book before ch. 40; 2) the indecisive argument from language; 3) the different views held about chs. 40-66; 4) the uniform tradition of the Jewish church. The methods and principles employed by the critics are to a great extent, (1) intellectually unsound; (2) morally irreverent and confusing in their tendencies; (3) scientifically unproductive and incredible.

This article presents an exceedingly strong argument for the older views of biblical science by using their best positions in a vigorous criticism of the newer school. Few would accept the old views if they were presented in a complete exposition, while the very boldness and progressiveness of the later criticism lay it open to assault. It is well to be reminded that one may go too fast in throwing aside what has been accepted in the past. This presentation is worth studying for its material, and demands study because of its want of order and clearness. One may note that Dr. Briggs declares in this very number of the *Review* (p. 663) that "no critic of eminence at the present day believes that Isaiah wrote chs. 40-66."

* By Principal George C. M. Douglass, D. D., in the *Presbyterian Review*, Oct., 1888, pp. 603-637.